



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,399	07/17/2003	Rajesh G. Ramchandi	188299/US	1398
66083	7590	07/03/2007		
SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC. c/o DORSEY & WHITNEY, LLP			EXAMINER	
370 SEVENTEENTH ST.			CAO, DIEM K.	
SUITE 4700				
DENVER, CO 80202				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/604,399	RAMCHANDI, RAJESH G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Diem K. Cao	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.


Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Baldwin et al (U.S. 2002/0112056 A1).**

As to claim 1, Baldwin teaches a method of automatically detecting a number of application program interfaces (APIs) and/or remote methods associated with a server computer (abstract), comprising:

requesting a list of the APIs and/or the exported remote methods from the server computer (The function portion of interface ... queried provider; page 3, paragraph 3, and page 5, paragraph 50), and

providing the list of APIs and/or remote methods in response to the request (returns functions supported ... queried provider; page 3, paragraph 3 and page 5, paragraph 50).

Art Unit: 2194

As to claim 2, Baldwin teaches wherein the requesting is associated with a client computer (a client 14; page 5, paragraph 50 and Fig. 1).

As to claim 3, Baldwin teaches sending a connection request to the server computer by the client computer based upon the list of APIs and/or remote methods, and connecting to the server computer by the client computer ("evaluate" command; page 1, paragraph 11, page 3, paragraph 37).

As to claim 4, Baldwin teaches a method for incorporating an electronic device (client 14; see Fig. 1 and abstract) into a network of electronic device into a network of electronic devices having at least one automatic API detection enabled server computer (provider 12; see Fig. 1 and abstract), comprising:

requesting a list of application programming interfaces (APIs) and/or exported remote methods from the electronic device to automatic API detection enabled server computer by the electronic device (The function portion of interface ... queried provider; page 3, paragraph 3, and page 5, paragraph 50),

responding to the request by providing a comprehensive list of APIs and remote methods by the server computer to the electronic device (returns functions supported ... queried provider; page 3, paragraph 3 and page 5, paragraph 50), and

connecting to the server computer by the electronic device using the comprehensive list of application programming interfaces (APIs) and exported remote methods wherein the electronic devices uses selected ones of the list of APIs and remote methods to communicate

Art Unit: 2194

with other members of the network by way of the server computer ("evaluate" command; page 1, paragraph 11, page 3, paragraphs 37-39).

As to claim 5, Baldwin teaches wherein the network is a heterogeneous network (see Fig. 1 and associated text).

As to claim 7, it is the same as the method claim of claim 4 except it is an apparatus claim and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

As to claim 8, see rejection of claim 5 above.

As to claim 10, it is the same as the method claim 4 except it is a computer program product and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

As to claim 11, see rejection of claim 5 above.

As to claim 13, Baldwin teaches
requesting an action to be performed by the server computer by the client computer based upon the list of APIs, and remote methods (a client executes a function ... call; page 3, paragraph 37),
performing the requested action by the server computer (page 5, paragraph 51), and

Art Unit: 2194

confirming that the requested action has been successfully performed (After the function ... to the client; page 3, paragraph 38).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 6, 9, 12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baldwin et al (U.S. 2002/0112056 A1) in view of Arnold (The Jini Architecture: Dynamic Services in a Flexible Network).**

As to claim 6, Baldwin teaches wherein the electronic device is a computer (see Fig. 1 and associated text). Baldwin does not explicitly teach the electronic device is selected from a group that includes a PDA, a computer, a processor embedded appliance, a cell phone. Arnold teaches the electronic device is selected from a group that includes a PDA, a computer, a processor embedded appliance, a cell phone (PDA, pager, phone, washing machine; page 5, section 9 and pages 9-10, section 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Arnold to the system of Baldwin because Arnold provides a system that allows small devices and legacy codes can be incorporated in to a network and provides services to multiple type of clients (page 5, section 9).

Art Unit: 2194

As to claim 9, see rejection of claim 6 above.

As to claim 12, see rejection of claim 6 above.

As to claim 14, Arnold teaches wherein the client computer is one of a number of client computers each of which is embedded in a remotely located network appliance (washing machine; page 5, section 9).

As to claim 15, Arnold teaches wherein some of the network appliances operate under a first type protocol and wherein others of the network appliances operate under a second type protocol wherein the first and second type protocols are different from each other (inherent from different type of devices, so each one is operated using different protocol).

As to claim 16, Baldwin as modified by Arnold teaches wherein each of the operation protocols has a particular list of APIs and/or remote methods associated therewith (see Baldwin: page 3, paragraph 32 and see Arnold, page 5, section 9).

As to claim 17, Baldwin as modified by Arnold teaches wherein the server computer responds to the request for the list of APIs and/or remote methods with the list of APIs and/or remote methods only associated with the requesting network appliance (see Baldwin: page 7, paragraph 73).

As to claim 18, Baldwin as modified by Arnold teaches downloading an operating script associated with each of the requesting network appliances based upon the particular list of APIs and/or remote methods associated with the requesting device (see Arnold, page 6, section 10, “you could make sensors ... distinction”).

As to claim 19, Baldwin as modified by Arnold teaches wherein the script includes a set of operating instructions corresponding to the particular network appliance (see Arnold, page 6, section 10, “you could make sensors ... distinction”).

As to claim 20, both Baldwin and Arnold do not teach wherein the script is a training program and the network appliance is a remotely operable training apparatus. However, Arnold teaches all type of devices can be incorporated into the network, it would have been obvious that the network appliance is a remotely operable training apparatus, thus the application can be a training program.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30AM - 3:30PM.

Art Unit: 2194

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DC

June 22, 2007


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER